Case 4:07-cv-05705-CW Document 6 Filed 11/09/2007 Page 1 of 3 1 William C. Wilka (CA Bar No. 79667) Dudnick, Detwiler, Rivin & Stikker, LLP 351 California Street, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, California 94104 3 (415) 982-1400 Louis W. Diess, III ldiess@mccarronlaw.com McCarron & Diess 6 4900 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Suite 310 7 Washington, D.C. 20016 (202) 364-0400 8 Attorneys for Plaintiff 9 10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 11 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 13 LEE-RAY TARANTINO CO., INC., d/b/a GOLDEN STATE PRODUCE CO. 14 Civil Action No: 15 **Plaintiff** ATTORNEY CERTIFICATION 16 WHY NOTICE SHOULD NOT ٧. BY REQUIRED PURSUANT 17 THEODORAS KOLIATSIS, d/b/a/ **TO RULE 65(B)** & GEARY FARMERS MARKET 18 19 Defendant 20 21 The undersigned represents plaintiff in this action to enforce the trust provisions 22 of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act (PACA), 7 U.S.C. §499e(c). 23 Notice of this motion should not be required because notice will afford defendant 24 an opportunity to dissipate trust assets that are required by statute to be held for the 25 benefit of plaintiff, a PACA trust creditor of defendants in the amount of \$328,344.36. 26 27 Defendants are under a statutory duty to pay promptly for produce from the trust 28 established by statute. Defendants have not disputed the debt in any way and have Attorney Certification Why Notice Should Not Be Required Pursuant to Rule 65(B)

failed to pay despite repeated demands. Between September 29, 2007 and October

 13, 2007, defendants tendered four (4) checks to plaintiff in the aggregate amount of \$76,000.00 in partial payment for the produce which was supplied by the plaintiff. However, all four (4) checks were returned by the bank due to insufficient funds. These facts demonstrate that defendants are failing to maintain sufficient assets in the statutory trust and have dissipated and will continue to dissipate the PACA trust in favor of plaintiff.

Advising defendants of the pendency of this motion will allow defendants to continue to pay non-trust debts with trust assets prior to the hearing in order to avoid serious personal liabilities, such as criminal liability for failure to pay withholding taxes. As noted in the House Report on the PACA trust amendment, once trust assets are dissipated, it is all but impossible to recover them. H.R. Rep. No. 543, 98<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2d Sess. 4 (1983), reprinted in 1984 U.S. Code & Admin. News 405, 411. See also Tanimura & Antle, Inc. v. Packed Fresh Produce, Inc., 222 F.3d 132 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 2000); J.R. Brooks & Son, Inc. v. Norman's Country Market, Inc., 98 B.R. 47 (Bkrtcy. N.D. Fla. 1989); DiMare Fresh Fruit v. Thomas J. Gatziolis & Co., 774 F.Supp. 449 (N.D. III. 1991); and Gullo Produce Co., Inc. v. Jordan Produce Co., Inc., 751 F.Supp. 64 (W.D. Pa. 1990).

Entry of a temporary restraining order without notice guarantees the performance of the statutory duty to preserve and pay trust assets, and prevents any further dissipation pending a further hearing, which can be set forthwith.

1

2 3

4

5 6

7

8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Dated this 9th day of November, 2007

DUDNICK, DETWILER, RIVIN & STIKKER, LLP

By: William C. Wilka (CA Bar No. 79667)

351 California Street, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, California 94104 (415) 982-1400

McCARRON & DIESS Louis W. Diess, III 4900 Massachusetts Ave., N.W. Washington, DC 20016 (202) 364-0400 Attorneys for Plaintiff